

## **Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – June 4, 2014**

Attending: Senator Janie Ward-Engelking (morning), Tracie Bent (morning), Superintendent Tom Luna, Penni Cyr, Ms. Kellerer Kellerer, Andy Grover, Hollis Brookover (in for Rod Gramer), Rep Steven Harris, Shawn Tiegs (Via conference call), Lisa Burtenshaw (via conference call), Katie Sparhawks (via conference call), Becky Meyers (via IEN), Christina Linter (via conference call- afternoon)

Superintendent Luna welcomed the group, went over the agenda, and talked about the last meeting. He advised that today there would be an update on the status of Tiers 1 and 2. We are going to look at what other states with multiple tiers are doing. Then we are going to have a group discussion about Tier 3. If we have time after lunch, the State Board has requested that we have more conversation about the appeals process that was presented to them. We don't necessarily need to have a new recommendation, but maybe some other ideas. We will discuss the concerns that were raised and how a teacher would appeal evaluations and things pertaining to movement on the ladder and continued licensure.

Supt. Luna shared that the committee is going to look at other states that have more than two tiers, but we are not just adopting a plan from another state. We are looking to see what they are doing and gather ideas. We are going to end up with a career ladder and tiered licensure that is unique to Idaho, developed by Idahoans and is focused on what we believe is best for Idaho schools, and therefore Idaho teachers and students.

Taylor Raney provided an update on Tiers 1 and 2. He shared that last week the committee's work was presented to State Board of Education.

### Initial Licensure (Tier 1)

- Minimum credit requirements
- Content test (Praxis II)
- *Assessment for effective teaching on Danielson-Aligned Evaluation Tool*

*Minimum basic ranking on all components*

- *Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP)*- developed at the university level with a mentor teacher and university supervisor
- *Measurable student achievement* - primarily done by student learning objectives at the higher education level.

Those are the requirements just to get into the profession.

### Professional Licensure (Tier 2)

- Professional development credits
- *Assessment for effective teaching on Danielson-Aligned Evaluation Tool*

*Minimum proficient ranking on all components*

- *Individualized Professional Learning Plan*
- *Measurable Student Achievement*

The State Board Committee asked us to refine what measureable student achievement looks like. We went through that at our last meeting and came up with some pretty specific recommendations.

The direction from the State Board Committee was that they will handle Tiers 1 and 2 now, and to discuss and come back with recommendations for Tier 3. Mr. Raney identified four questions to discuss at today's meeting:

- How does a teacher earn Tier 3 status?
- How does that teacher maintain that status?
- Is it possible to move back to Tier 2?
- If so, what does that process look like?

Mr. Raney proceeded to outline some other states structures of their Tier 3 licensure:

#### New Mexico

- Meet Tier 2 requirements  
Complete mentoring program  
Teach three years  
Submit professional development dossier  
Evidence of student learning  
Evidence of effective teaching  
Evidence of professional development OR National Board Certification  
Professional Development Plan (PDP)  
Principal's evaluation based on the PDP (submitted with application)  
\$320 application fee, for review by independent reviewers
- Meet Tier 3 requirements  
Masters or National Board Certification  
Same as Tier 2, with increased expectations in evaluations, student achievement (better scores)  
\$320 independent review searches for evidence of "exceeding standards"

#### Ohio

- Masters degree or higher
- Nine years teaching (at least five years under "professional" license)
- Successful completion of the Master Teacher Portfolio at *distinguished* level
- Teacher-Leader endorsement
- National Board Certification

#### Maryland

- 3 years teaching experience
- Masters degree OR 36 hours of course work, 21 of which must be graduate level OR National Board Certification
- Resident Teacher Certificate "valid for two years; issued to an applicant who has been selected by a local school system to participate in a specialized program"

## Georgia

- 5 years teaching experience
- Professional level passing score on the GACE exam
- Three years of evaluations on the state system

Exemplary performance ratings and advanced education

- Separate Tier 3 (Lead Professional) Designation

Same as the above plus . . .

Endorsement in teacher leader, instructional coaching, or teacher support specialist

Passing score on GACE Teacher Leadership content assessment

Ms. Bent shared that she spoke with a representative from Georgia recently when she was at a conference and that person shared with her that the reason for the two Tier 3 levels was to distinguish between people who are outstanding educators and those that are outstanding teachers who can teach other teachers and be mentors and teacher leaders.

Mr. Raney reiterated the four questions we need to discuss at today's meeting:

- How does a teacher earn Tier 3 status?
- How does that teacher maintain that status?
- Is it possible to move back to Tier 2?
- If so, what does that process look like?

Supt. Luna asked Jason Hancock to talk about the first year that Tier 3 becomes applicable and funded. Mr. Hancock shared that his understanding is that there is a six year planned phase-in on the career ladder task force recommendation. No one goes into Tier 3 until at least the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the phase-in. The first year is transitioning people over to the new grid.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Hancock to clarify that the legislature already took one step towards career ladder in funding teacher leadership portion. Is it 6 years after that? Mr. Hancock responded "Yes." He further stated that the legislature's current plan takes six years to get to the goal. The legislature didn't feel they were at a point to pass a career ladder into law since Tiered licensure needs to go with it. They took the first year and split it into two pieces. Since the career ladder couldn't really go without tiered licensure, they made what progress they could and took care of the leadership awards portion. That wasn't dependent on tiered licensure being ready, so they were able to buy down the cost of that first year and make what progress they could. They left the career ladder transition to next year's legislature.

Supt. Luna asked Mr. Hancock if teachers would begin moving into Tier 3 in January of 2017 and clarified that the funding for Tier 3 would be available in 2017. Mr. Hancock said that if the 2015 legislature creates the career ladder, in the 2015-16 school year teachers would be transitioning over to the new career ladder. Then the 2016 legislature would provide the next step up in funding, as well as paying for the cost of some teachers moving up to Tier 3. Therefore, the 2016-17 school year would be the first year that you would have teachers in Tier 3. The assumption is that 25% of teachers in Tier 2 would qualify for movement to Tier 3.

Ms. Bent clarified that it was her understanding that existing teachers with at least 3 years of experience would be grandfathered in to Tier 2 or the professional level. Then, based on whatever the requirements are for Tier 3, they could potentially start moving to Tier 3, or stay at the professional Tier until it's time to renew and then move at that time if they qualify. Jason, what you're saying is that as soon as two years out from approval, teachers could start moving to tier 3? Mr. Hancock responded by advising that the task force model showed that teachers would not have to wait 5 years to move to Tier 3. If you qualify for Tier 3 you could move in the second year of the career ladder. By that point would have enough years of evaluation under our current model to justify moving to Tier 3.

Ms. Cyr asked whether people who have already met the requirements for Tier 3 could transition more quickly if the funding is available the second year. She made a motion that National Board (NB) Certification be one way that a teacher can move into Tier 3. Mr. Tiegs seconded the motion. It was clarified that there are several other states use NB Certification as a way to move into Tier 3. New Mexico already does, and Georgia is funneling people that way. They allow other routes, but NB is at the top of their list. Washington uses NB as one of its options for movement.

The question was raised about whether the committee already had enough information about NB to make this decision or whether they needed additional information. Senator Ward-Engelking noted that NB is very rigorous and takes anywhere from one to three years. Candidates have to have a lot of portfolio work, examples that have to be presented to show that you really are an effective teacher in the classroom. You have to compile student data, as well as your own data about engaging children in problem-solving and creative assignments. She expressed the opinion that it should be used as at least one criteria or possibility to move into tier 3. Ms. Cyr added that the portfolio is evaluated by a group of peers. You take videos and reflect on what you're doing and the process. You follow several students throughout different units that you have taught and discuss their progress and growth. It is an extremely rigorous process. Supt. Luna shared that he is a fan of NB Certification.

There was additional discussion about the length of time and cost required to complete NB Certification. Ms. Cyr shared that she completed the process in one year, but it is different for every teacher. She also shared that NB is changing to a three-year process. The committee members' recollections are that the cost is around \$2800, plus the cost of six to eight college credits.

Ms. Kellerer shared that she is not opposed to this idea, but questioned whether the committee should talk about all the requirements for Tier 3 before a decision is made. She stated that what she really likes about NB is the evidence of student growth, reflection on the part of the teacher, and evidence of professional growth. A more broad approach could be to say that whether you use NB Certification or a Masters degree, these are the key components we would be looking for. Ms. Kellerer expressed that she thought the committee should determine what it is that makes NB appropriate, and whether there are avenues to get there besides NB.

Ms. Cyr said that she sees this as one track to get to Tier 3. She stated that when she compares the completion of her Masters program and her NB Certification she grew immensely over the

NB process. She was teaching when she completed the NB process and her students were part of her journey. She shared that her Masters program wasn't as directly related to students and what she was doing in the classroom. It was agreed that it would be ideal if her Masters program had done those things, as well.

At this point Supt. Luna clarified that Ms. Cyr's motion was that NB would be one of them, not the only one. He was thinking that there would be additional requirements on the NB pathway to move to Tier 3. There still could be an evaluation component, as well. Ms. Cyr responded by saying that all the pieces were part of the NB Certification process. Those pieces are possibly embedded in the Masters process also. She clarified that NB Certification must be renewed every 10 years. Supt. Luna asked how much weight is put on student growth in the NB process. Ms. Cyr shared that there is one portion that is about community and working with parents, and then two parts are about working with students, collaborating with peers, monitoring student growth over time. There is one more component regarding what you are doing as a professional. Ms. Kellner responded by saying that it clearly has components of the work that was done in Tier 2. There are multiple measures, depending on content, to demonstrate student growth.

Ms. Cyr clarified that regarding her motion, she did not move that NB be one of the requirements to move to Tier 3, but that it was one of the tracks or ways to get to Tier 3.

Representative Harris commented that this seems clearly appropriate for the career ladder piece, but isn't sure how it fits into licensure. Are those combined or separate? Supt. Luna responded by explaining that the career ladder is the funding side. How you advance in the career ladder is tiered licensure. Having accomplished Tier 3 designates your compensation. He expressed that he think it's appropriate to talk about it with tiered licensure because movement on the career ladder will decide which level of compensation that teacher is receiving. Representative Harris commented that Supt. Luna just outline a one-to-one correlation between the career ladder and tiered licensure. He said that wasn't his impression in reviewing the Governor's Task Force recommendations. Mr. Hancock responded that in the case of master licensure you are getting closer to that one-to-one relationship between licensure and the career ladder. The match is not as close in the first two tiers, especially at first. As we transition we will have many people who will hold a Tier 2 license that will be on step 1 on the career ladder. Eventually as time passes, there will be a better match between licensure and the career ladder. Tier 3 pretty well lines up between licensure and the career ladder.

Representative Harris said that it sounds as though with that tight tie between the two we can accomplish what we want to with just the career ladder. It seems like we lost the reason for Tier 3. Mr. Hancock stated that in this case your licensure drives where you are at on the career ladder. You never get to the third tier on the ladder unless you get a Tier 3 license. Representative Harris asked if we were using the term "tier" for the ladder, as well as for licensure. Mr. Hancock responded that "master level" and "Tier 3" are used interchangeably. There hasn't been legislation on this yet, so it hasn't been officially named.

Superintendent Luna stated regarding the motion before the committee, if the motion is that NB is the only requirement that moves one from Tier 2 to Tier 3, he's not ready to make that commitment until he knows more details on NB certification. We may need to have a

presentation made to the committee regarding the details of NB. They discussed who might be able to attend the next meeting and present. Shawn was asked to share his thoughts, since he seconded the motion. He stated that the research shows it impacts student achievement and is meaningful and respected around the country. He said he would definitely support it as a means to move into Tier 3. Ms. Kellerer shared that she has looked up the components of NB that are measured and evaluated. She confirmed that the final submissions are scored by peers and are rubric based. The areas are as follows:

- Strong command of content
- Ability to design appropriate learning experiences that advance student learning
- Use of assessments to inform instructional decision making
- partnerships with colleagues, parents, and the community

Ms. Cyr added that only 33% of the teacher evaluation looks at student growth and achievement. Since two component of NB are related to student growth, that 50% of NB Certification deals extensively with student growth.

Ms. Bent shared that she is not opposed to using NB and they do have research to support that teachers who have received it impact students in a positive way. She states that she would like to discuss other options to be included with NB, such as whether or not there should be specified years of experience in the classroom. She said she is not prepared to vote on whether NB, by itself would be a track to Tier 3.

Ms. Kellerer suggested that the committee continue looking at the things that are common between Tiers 1 and 2 and that those requirements might align nicely with Tier 3, as well, whether the decision is made to use NB or a Masters degree as tracks to Tier 3. If the committee looks at what Mr. Raney presented regarding what other states are requiring, all the states have a requirement of a specified amount of years of experience, as well as some sort of measurable student achievement requirement as one of their components. It seems like our Tier 3 movement might require some level of contracted teaching experience and some type of performance-based measurement, which includes student achievement. It could be a Masters degree that has those components, or NB and then a continuing IPLP that guides the whole process. She said that she thinks she is advocating that those three components might be required for moving into Tier 3. She was not making a motion, just talking out loud.

Mr. Tiegs added that NB requires that their candidates have three years of teaching experience.

The decision was made to table Ms. Cyr's motion until after lunch when they have had more time to discuss this.

Supt. Luna proposed that the committee go back to discussing the four questions previously reviewed. They are still discussing how an individual moves from Tier 2 to Tier 3? A lot of the conversation is going to be about student achievement. Where does that fit in this movement from Tiers 2 to 3? Right now we have a specific requirement that deals with student achievement. Mr. Raney reviewed language already put forward to move from Tier 1 to Tier 2:

- To move and maintain in Tier 2 there are three assessments to demonstrate student achievement (Of those three the Smarter Balanced Assessment and IRI must be included, if they apply)

Tom stated that if that is the minimum requirement to move to Tier 2, it ought to be a requirement to move from Tier 2 to Tier 3. You should at least still be performing at that level. Ms. Kellerer and Ms. Brookover voiced agreement. There was discussion that the State Board did not make substantive changes. They took changed a few of the proposed assessments. They were looking at what is broad enough to be applicable to all districts and still shows growth.

Ms. Kellerer and Ms. Cyr shared that they have each had several conversations with special education teachers and they are concerned about what “growth” means? IEPs hold special education teachers accountable under the legal system to demonstrate growth, and I’m not sure we’ve represented that there. We have teachers who feel like perhaps they are at a disadvantage. Mr. Raney said that in his mind the student learning objectives are right up the alley of an IEP. That is exactly what an IEP does. Special education teachers are fantastic at setting benchmarks, monitoring growth, and examining outcomes. He stated that he doesn’t think special education teachers will have any problem representing growth and if that needs to be included in the language that is easy to do.

Ms. Cyr shared that she thinks one of the concerns of special education teachers is that the Smarter Balanced Assessment be one of the measures, and term, “if applicable” because the students that they serve take the Smarter Balanced Assessment. Does that mean that it reflects their growth and achievement? Ms. Kellerer agreed. She said that our special education teachers are probably the best at assessing student growth and demonstrating growth. They felt that what is coming out is not representing what they do. Ms. Kellerer said she expressed to these teachers that our goal is to have multiple measures.

Supt. Luna said that he also understood that the Council on Developmental Disabilities wanted to make sure that there was not an impression that students with disabilities cannot grow academically, or that teachers cannot be held accountable. It can be done. It can be measured student growth. We shouldn’t have tiered licensure of a career ladder or that excludes teachers who work with students with disabilities, especially if the reason is that the impression is that students with disabilities can’t grow academically.

Supt. Luna reiterated that the committee has some language that they presented to the State Board. They have done some massaging of the language, but for the most part they were agreeable to it. We could present language that when it comes to student achievement, whatever we adopt for Tier 2 will be the same for Tier 3, then we don’t have to get any more specific than that. It seems that the overall question that we still need to discuss is how student achievement fits in? If we use NB Certification, is there student achievement on top of that? If so, what is it?

Ms. Kellerer suggested that within the NB process you can include three separate measurements, Smarter Balanced Assessment being one of them as appropriate, IRI, as appropriate and within that process I think you can meet those requirements.

Tom proposed that perhaps we have language that addresses NB as a path, and then in the language it states within NB Certification the other requirements have already been met. In other words, if we have a path other than NB Certification that states that there is a student achievement requirement, and it has three or four other things, but NB Certification trumps all of those, in the language it would state that within that NB Certification you meet the other requirements that are listed.

Ms. Kellerer suggested that a crosswalk could be created to show the correlation with the other requirements, including an alignment with Danielson's framework. Would we need IPLP that streamlines with NB? We have been specific about including language about Danielson alignment in first two tiers. She also mentioned the six credit minimum credit requirement in Tier 2 and asked if it would apply to Tier 3 also.

Ms. Cyr reminded the committee of some of the various states they looked at today and their requirements. Sometimes it is included but not called out specifically.

Mr. Grover added that he also thinks there should be a discussion about advanced degrees and whether there would be an option to use those as a track.

Ms. Kellerer suggested we use 'performance based measurement of teacher quality' and then list some avenues that would get people to Tier 3. Key components of that would include student learning outcomes, growth.

Supt. Luna proposed that in order to move to Tier 3, the person has to maintain the Tier 2 requirements. Then, in addition to that they can either be NB Certified or have Masters degrees or content degrees. When it comes to student achievement or any of those other measures, it's no more than what we currently require to maintain a Tier 2 license, but on top of that, you are also going to be NB Certified.

Ms. Cyr stated that she can't agree if the intent is to require the evaluation piece be included in the Tier 3 requirements. She would like to look at Tier 3 without pulling in the local evaluation.

Ms. Kellerer said she was thinking that there would be three bullet items: first, something dealing with years of teaching experience because that's common with other states and aligns with our structure; second, performance based measurement of teacher quality – a key component of that has to be student achievement or student growth, and there are multiple ways to demonstrate that; and third, to keep us aligned with Danielson and be consistent, would be to continue the IPLP. Ms. Cyr clarified that under performance based measure or teacher quality, other things could be considered there. Ms. Kellerer agreed but additionally stated that she was concerned that nationally teacher education preparation programs are going towards having a four-year degree and then adding the pedagogy. If that trend continues, teachers will not be able to enter the profession until they have a Masters degree. We may want to use language such as 'advanced degrees,' rather than Masters. Generally those Masters degrees are related to instructional leadership and curriculum. It is less common to have Masters programs in content areas.



Ms. Brookover asked if there is any data that shows that advanced degrees equal improved student achievement. Ms. Kellerer responded that there are multiple pieces of data that say that an advanced degree does not necessarily equal student achievement. She explained that what she is suggesting is that at least in our programs in Idaho, and those that we accept as appropriate, that there would be a component related to evidence that a teacher is improving and reflecting on student achievement. Many of our Idaho programs reflect that already, but others don't.

Mr. Raney asked if she was suggesting a similar review process or program approval for the Masters or advanced degrees. Ms. Kellerer clarified that during the existing review process we would ask universities to provide evidence to show that their students are impacting student achievement in the classroom. Supt. Luna mentioned that we would want to consider how specific we want to be about what is acceptable, whether that means they have to be content specific or at least put some side boards on what is an acceptable Masters degree. Mr. Grover stated that a few years ago we changed the requirements for renewal credits and that they had to ties to education areas. He said he doesn't think it's any stretch to specify that their advanced degree needs to be tied to their pedagogy or to their content, as well.

Ms. Kellerer replied that she felt it could go either way. Pedagogy embedded with content would be a much stronger program. Leaving them the option or either deciding they need deeper content and am pursuing my Masters in content, or I am pursuing my Masters degree to change or increase my pedagogy within the content. Supt. Luna confirmed that they are thinking that they would put some side boards in place.

Supt. Luna asked Ms. Burtenshaw if they have policies in place at their board level for recognizing Masters degrees or NB, other than the current salary grid or NB stipend process. Ms. Burtenshaw responded that they do not. She also indicated that she would agree that a Masters in a specific content area rather than just a general Masters degree has proven to be more valuable by way of showing student achievement.

Mr. Grover wanted clarification regarding content specific Masters degrees. He said that the majority of Masters degrees he sees are in education leadership and curriculum. He felt that should still count because that does help promote those classrooms, as well.

Supt. Luna asked Blas Telleria from the Boise District if he could you support that. Mr. Telleria confirmed that their district could support that.

Supt. Luna said he would like to begin identifying the ways that the committee would want to see a teacher demonstrate in order to move to tier 3. Then the committee members can vote on each way individually.

Supt. Luna clarified that when Mr. Hancock was discussing funding, he mentioned a 24% figure for Tier 3. Supt. Luna wanted to make sure that everyone understood that there is not a proposal that we cap the number of teachers that can move into Tier 3. The 25% number is just an estimate of the expectation so that a budget projection could be put together.

Mr. Raney shared that he had found an online of the crosswalk between Danielson's Framework and NB. There are subtle differences, but it looks like there is evidence that someone who achieves NB certification would fare well when compared to the elements of Danielson's framework rubric.

Supt. Luna expressed that he feels like this takes the committee closer to having multiple tracks to Tier 3, and one of those being NB Certification. The group began to discuss how long someone would need to be in Tier 2 before moving to Tier 3. In response, Ms. Bent suggested that the committee also needs to discuss teachers who come to Idaho from other states and how long we would require them to stay in Tier 2 before they can move to Tier 3. Would we require them to stay in Tier 2 for a specified number of years before allowing them to move, even though they may be experienced teachers? She mentioned that it seems like to go through the process, teachers will have at least three years of experience going through Tiers 1 and 2 and asked whether three years is enough.

Mr. Hancock reminded the committee that the Governor's Task Force had recommended five years in Tier 2 before they could move to Tier 3, but they also approved a career ladder model that was based on the assumption that anyone who is Tier 2 and has met the criteria for Tier 3 can move. There is room to maneuver in the zero to five year range.

Ms. Kellerer shared that in thinking about her experience as a building principal she had a variety of teachers at different levels in years of teaching. She would like to build a system that is flexible to allow people to excel when they are ready to excel. She doesn't think that five years at Tier 2 makes a teacher ready. She thinks there will be teachers ready earlier and allow for some amount of flexibility.

Tom mentioned that in other recommendations, the Task Force is moving towards looking at more mastery based requirements, rather than time based. He suggested that perhaps the committee should look at performance and mastery, instead of time. Mr. Raney asked if a person would be able to go from Tier 1 to Tier 3 if you are demonstrating mastery. If not, then you are going to have a requirement of at least one year in year Tier 2. Ms. Cyr confirmed that if people are completing their Masters program at the same time they are completing their certification, you could have people coming in to Tier 1 with that Masters degree already.

Ms. Kellerer questioned whether the committee had defined what Tier 3 is? She stated that they had talked about the requirements, but what does it mean? Representative Harris responded that in his mind, a license is permission to perform. If that is the case, the Tier 3 requirements need to point out what permission to perform is different at Tier 3 than Tier 2.

Ms. Bent commented that Tier 3 identifies truly exceptional teachers. This group hasn't talked about whether mentoring would be a requirement of Tier 3 teachers, but she hopes that school districts would look to those exceptional teachers to provide mentoring and teacher leader skills. TO her, Tier 3 is to distinguish those teachers that are truly exceptional. Ms. Brookover voiced her agreement with that.

Ms. Cyr said they had looked at a plan that distinguished between those teachers who wanted to be mentors and could teach teachers and those who were exceptional teachers. She expressed that she is not sure want to go into allowing people to mentor others. Representative Harris said that sounds like career ladder to him.

Ms. Kellerer discussed the state that had those two pathways, and then posed the question, what if you have the skills, but choose not to exercise them? That is the tricky part of having a system like that. If it is related to a career ladder and you are earning more to have that permission, could you choose not to exercise those skills.

Ms. Burtenshaw stated that she agrees with Representative Harris. That is where licensing is state permission to have employment, but a lot of what we are talking about really is career ladder. She shared that she worries that the committee is getting too far into saying it is a license, rather than an opportunity to advance your career. She gets concerned about the due process.

The discussion continued regarding whether there should be an amount of time someone would have to be in Tier 2 before moving to Tier 3. The process that has been developed probably indicates that there will be some amount of time. There was general agreement that there should be some period of required time in Tier 2. The suggestion was made that a total of five years of experience be required, since teachers will be spending three years in Tier 1, then two more in Tier 2. The years don't necessarily have to in the classroom, but they have to be contracted in education. The clarification was made that the discussion was centered on a total year amount, but maybe it should be spelled out that there is a minimum number of years spent in Tier 2, to avoid the possibility that however unlikely, someone could spend 5 years in Tier 1 and jump to Tier 3.

Ms. Kellerer returned to the discussion regarding "What is Tier 3?" Is Tier 3 the ability to teach other teachers? Is Tier 3 only our most exceptional teachers? She asked what the words were that came out of the task force.

Representative Harris stated that if it's only permission to earn additional money, it's not really a licensure thing yet. He said he is still struggling with what Tier 3 is and why we need it. It feels hard to define how a teacher qualifies for it and what it means.

Ms. Cyr agreed that there is confusion. It seems like career ladder and licensure has to be tied, when it doesn't. She said we could remain with the same licensure system we have now, only one tier, but then have a career ladder system that had levels of career growth and things that you had to do to earn additional pay. The rigor of renewing that certification could even increase. She said that she would prefer that because she feels that this should be about the professional growth of teachers over their career. As a teacher gets better and grows as a professional, student growth and achievement will increase. Also, it allows a way for teachers to stay in the classroom and earn more money. Currently, if they want to earn more money they have to look at other positions, such as administrator. She stated that she is strongly opposed and will remain in opposition to a system that ties evaluation to the revocation of licensure.

Ms. Kellerer reviewed notes from the Task Force and voiced the opinion that perhaps the confusion is originating from those notes. They clearly suggest that career ladder should be tied to tiered licensure. In addition, they suggested that criteria for movement should include experience, professional experience, and accountability based on performance. Those are the areas that the Task Force brought up. Ms. Cyr followed up by saying that they then recommended putting together a committee to determine the details. Ultimately, the plan should be based on input from everyone. Looking at these recommendations from the Task Force is a starting place of where we can go.

Supt. Luna said that what the committee needs to do is identify the questions that need to be answered so we can have a policy or recommendation to the State Board. Here are the questions:

1. Are we going to have multiple tracks?
2. NB Certification - should we look at what other ways teachers could meet the same components? Do they cover all 5 components or are we missing something? Can it qualify in and of itself. Can it crosswalk to other requirements. Look at NB domains and whether we need to make sure those crosswalk with other tracks?
3. What role will a Masters degree play? If we use it, what kind of side boards do we put on Masters degrees?
4. Years of service? Total years included? Is there a minimum amount of time teacher must spend it tier 2 before moving to 3?
5. Do they have to meet all of tier 2 to move onto tier 3
6. Growth on Danielson. Do they have to hit a certain number of distinguished marks in order to move to Tier 3?
7. Should student achievement be a factor in moving from 2 to 3
8. Professional learning plan
9. Define leadership role – Does it include mentoring? What if there aren't mentoring positions open?
10. Value of out-of state, out-of-district experience

The committee discussed leadership bonuses. They felt that those bonuses are not associated with Tier 3, since there is language separating leadership bonuses from the career ladder. Leadership bonuses are not associated with rungs on career ladder. Leadership bonus money can be given to anyone, regardless of which Tier they are in. It is left up to the district how they want to define leadership role and to determine who earns those bonuses.

Ms. Kellerer expressed that she thinks Tier 3 is to designate master teachers and is not necessarily related to mentoring or leadership.

Representative Harris stated that if Tier 3 is about leadership, it seems like a push to get people out of the classroom and in to some management position.

Supt. Luna proposed that leadership is doing things that are outside the scope of the contract. Tier 3 should not require a teacher to go above what is required by their contract, except having exceptional outcomes and results in student success. The things we define as leadership, such as mentoring and curriculum development, those are the things that are over and above that would constitute leadership.

Representative Harris said that if licensure is permission to perform, and you can define what those things are-they may include mentoring and curriculum, but that's not where we're going with this, so it seems appropriate to exclude those things from Tier 3. You could have a license that allows one to do specific leadership tasks.

Mr. Raney summarized where the group ended before lunch. He presented a proposal of where it looks like the committee is heading. (Presents his document) Let's see how well what I have drafted meets all the questions. Here is the draft:

To qualify for a Tier 3 certificate, all requirements for Tier 2 (IPLP, Danielson, student achievement, credits) must first be met. Teachers must have taught a minimum of five years, two of which must be while serving as a Tier 2 certificate-holder. \* To reach Tier 3, teachers may choose one of the following performance-based pathways:

- Pathway 1 – National Board Certification, *understanding that within that process rests several opportunities to demonstrate personal professional growth, as well as growth of student achievement.*
- Pathway 2 – Approved advanced degree, defined as those pertaining to content in the teacher's certification area (or intended endorsement area), pedagogy appropriate for the certification, administration.
  - student achievement – three consecutive years of significant student growth, as defined by the local school district
  - a yet-to-be-determined number of “distinguished” components in each of the four Danielson domains during three consecutive years
- Pathway 3 - Consulting teacher endorsement (currently available in special education and mathematics)
  - student achievement - three consecutive years of significant student growth, as defined by the local school district
  - a yet-to-be-determined number of “distinguished” components in each of the four Danielson domains during three consecutive years

\*Except in the first year of Tier 3 availability, when only one year on Tier 2 would be necessary.

Out of state –

Pathways 2 and 3 - districts may apply for a provisional X-year Tier 3 certification for teachers with a minimum 5 years successful contracted experience, to provide opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate Tier 3 competencies.

Maintenance of Tier 3 certification is contingent on maintenance of the National Board Certification for pathway 1, and maintenance of the stipulations for pathways 2 and 3.

Mr. Raney suggested that the committee look at the questions developed in order and compare the answers to the questions to his drafted language. Supt. Luna asked if everyone was in agreement that there will be multiple tracks to Tier 3? Ms. Kellerer responded by questioning whether the committee wanted to consider if there would ever be a teacher leader endorsement created that would lead to Tier 3? Supt. Luna recommended that the committee answer the first question before they consider Ms. Kellerer's questions. Everyone was in agreement that there should be multiple tracks to Tier 3.

The next question Next question is regarding NB Certification and should it be a solo requirement for movement to Tier 3. Supt. Luna said his response is yes, as long as there are other requirements in the NB Certification process, like student achievement, evidence that there is equivalency to proficiencies on Danielson's Framework. Ms. Brookover stated that she would like to see a requirement that people spend a couple years in Tier 2 to avoid the situation that someone could go from Tier 1 to Tier 3. Supt. Luna pointed out that we will address that when we answer question four. Ms. Kellerer said she thought it might be related depending on what the word "sole" means in the question. She wanted clarification if that meant regardless of how many years you have taught or regardless of successful teaching. Are we suggesting that if you pass the National Board nothing else matters? Ms. Cyr stated that she thinks NB should be a direct route to Tier 3. She further shared that NB requires that you teach for three years before you can even apply to start the process. The process takes at least a year. You could potentially have NB Certification at the end of four years, rather than five. She stated that she would object to saying that individuals must spend two years in Tier 2 because that could stop a really dynamic teacher from completing NB in one year and moving to Tier 3.

Ms. Brookover asked if Ms. Cyr would you agree to one year. Ms. Cyr responded that she would agree to allowing the NB process be a pathway, solo, to Tier 3. It has its own natural requirements and by its nature it already has the side boards on it. Representative Harris expressed that is a lot of weight to put on NB, and that it becomes an all or nothing thing. It seems it would be possible to complete those requirements, but not our Idaho requirements and still move into Tier 3, earning more money. He stated that he was concerned with that one national thing.

Tom clarified that this is one of multiple paths. He stated that he is assuming that one of the other paths is going to require some amount of time teaching. Supt. Luna proposed that the committee accept NB Certification as long as the requirements we are looking for in other pathways are imbedded in the process. It sounds like it's close, especially in the years of teaching required. The group's consensus was that most people are not rushing in to the process and the majority are likely to take longer than one year. Representative Harris voiced the concern that this one measurement could become the fast path to Tier 3. Is it comparable to the other pathways to Tier 3 licensing?

Mr. Grover said that if it is a standalone pathway, a teacher can do poorly on any their evaluations from the Danielson model that is now in place and still be able to make Tier 3 based on NB. Ms. Cyr disagreed because a district would not keep someone employed if they have two years of scores showing basic skills. She also stated that NB is not a fast path to anywhere. It is a rigorous process and puts teachers at the level of distinguished. Ms. Linder agreed. She said that the teacher has to tape teaching and provide artifacts. The structure for NB is very much the same as Danielson's Framework for Teaching. Ms. Linder further stated that she doesn't think it is possible for someone to get NB and not have exceptional teaching strategies. There are a lot of teachers who don't want to go back to school. This is a very respectful, appropriate and valuable path.

Supt. Luna said that he thinks they agree that NB Certification will be all or part of a path. He proposed that the committee discuss what a pathway without NB Certification would look like.

Once we come up with agreement on that, let's compare that to NB Certification to see if NB is equal to or exceeds those requirements. Setting NB Certification aside, what would the minimum requirements be for someone to move from Tier 2 to 3? He suggested they start with years of service. Is this where it would be appropriate to say that we want to see at least two or three years in Tier 2 as one of the requirements?

Mr. Grover asserted that he thinks it should be state that is the minimum so when people look at the language they don't think they only have two or three years to get this done. There was discussion about whether the committee could agree on a minimum of five years, at least two of which have to be in Tier 2. Supt. Luna made a motion to adopt the language that one of the requirements to move from Tier 2 to Tier 3 is that teachers must have taught a minimum of five years, two of which must be while serving as a Tier 2 certificate holder. Ms. Kellerer said that she would second as long as it is understood this just refers to this one route. Supt. Luna confirmed that is what they are discussing. Ms. Cyr said her concern is that they set aside her motion this morning to work on the requirements for another track and now there is a motion to vote on a piece of that track. She stated that she would like to see the track before voting. Supt. Luna clarified that he was trying to identify if there was any low hanging fruit they can agree on, they won't have to re-visit this over and over. He said he didn't have a problem putting the whole track together and then voting. Supt. Luna asked if everyone was comfortable with the language so far.

Ms. Kellerer asked if this will stop grandfathered people from moving to Tier 3 within the first year. She clarified that she is specifically talking about whether this language would prevent our current teachers from moving to Tier 3 for an extra year. The committee added asterisk language to their recommendation regarding an exception for current teachers for the first year of Tier 3 availability, when only one year of Tier 2 experience would be necessary.

Supt. Luna asked what other components would be found in that second path. Mr. Raney shared that the way he wrote it up was that there had to be an approved advanced degree through PSC and the State Board, being able to show student achievement beyond what is expected of a regular teacher, and some number of distinguished components on the Danielson Framework, in addition to all the Tier 2 requirements. Ms. Cyr commented that even Charlotte Danielson says that teachers visit distinguished on occasion. Ms. Kellerer spoke about requiring teachers to meet all the Tier 2 requirements, which would imply that you maintain Tier 2. She suggested that if the committee doesn't have more than that, maybe there is not a need for Tier 3. She recommended being more general and saying they need to be distinguished in at least 25% of the components distinguished. That would allow for multiple ways of achieving the required number of distinguished components. She added that she still thinks that if the committee is going to create a Tier 3, there has to be something that makes this teacher different from other teachers.

Ms. Linder stated that she agreed with Ms. Kellerer. She stated that she thinks the difference between a proficient and a distinguished level of teaching is putting the student learning into their hands and really learning how to do those kinds of individualized things. It is something highly skilled teachers do. These are the people we will have young teachers watch, they should consistently have those skills and know how to get there. She also said she would like to see

opportunities for extra endorsements, such as the Teacher Leader endorsement, also fall under additional qualifications. Supt. Luna confirmed that the committee is discussing multiple pathways to Tier 3 and this is one of two options we have been discussing so far. Ms. Linder responded that she wants to make sure we are thinking about the language and that if we use language such as “advanced degree” it doesn’t necessarily have to be an advanced degree, but could be specific endorsements that have been designed using the research about how to keep distinguished teachers in the field and in the classroom. Ms. Linder clarified that she wants to make sure that someone with a very literal interpretation isn’t going to say that those endorsements don’t meet the definition of “degree” since she didn’t see the language there.

Mr. Raney suggested the possibility of having a third pathway for endorsements like Teacher Leader. It could also be that these advanced degrees lead to institutional recommendations for these endorsements.

Supt. Luna asked the committee to focus on second path. He said they have already identified a minimum amount of time. He asked if an advanced degree is going to be a minimum requirement in the second pathway they are identifying.

Christina asked the committee If the whole point of our system is that the process is, in and of itself, a benefit to the teacher and to the students, do we know which advanced degrees we know of that actually contribute to professionalism or student achievement. She acknowledged that content degrees for those secondary teachers teaching content do have some impact, b She suggested being more general and saying they need to be distinguished in at least 25% of the components distinguished. That would allow for multiple ways of achieving the required number of distinguished components, but I don’t know of any other advanced degrees. Supt. Luna shared that the committee had had an earlier conversation regarding advanced degrees. He shared that he felt like what the committee came to agreement on was that if an advanced degrees is required, it would have to be an advanced degree that has been approved by the PSC as being applicable to improving student achievement, if it is to be used to meet this requirement.

Ms. Linder said that made sense to her. She shared that she has seen too many online degree programs with absolutely no value. She voiced her opinion that she would not want to see blanket language about any advanced degree being allowed for Tier 3 movement.

Ms. Cyr stated that she did not think the committee was that specific in the conversation this morning, regarding PSC approval, or anyone else, before it could be approved. There was discussion about what kinds of Masters programs are out there and that they should be applicable to your content, but we did not get that specific in our conversation this morning. Ms. Kellerer agreed. She feels that it goes back to the question about NB Certification. What are the things that are a necessary component of NB Certification that we are drawn to. It is things like it being heavy on teacher reflection, having a strong piece on evaluating student achievement and growth, and nice pieces related to professionalism and continued growth. She questioned whether there ways to say, in Idaho if you are going to offer a Masters program that will move you toward Tier 3, do you have those same essential components. Our mechanism to make sure that happens runs through the PSC through program approval. Things like curriculum and leadership do not going through the PSC process. Anything that leads to an endorsement is



already run through the PSC. Programs would have to show proof of how programs align to requirements. She feels that a natural mechanism that we have would be the Professional Standards Commission. Most of our programs would do well to consider and incorporate these things so it is a stronger piece of professional development. She confirmed that she agrees with Ms. Linder, that this could be accomplished through an endorsement, and not necessarily a degree.

Supt. Luna suggested that the committee treat this as an “or” if they decide to go there. It sounds like the committee agrees that some form of advanced degree should be part of moving to Tier 3. Everyone agrees that it needs to be a relevant advanced degree that we are comfortable is going to have an impact on student learning. Someone has to make that determination about which programs would be recognized as qualifying to meet this requirement. He asked who will make that decision. Ms. Kellerer commented that there are a lot of providers that are not in-state and are not governed by the PSC. She said she thinks the way the process would work is to identify key components within the Masters program which make it worthwhile and then be able to evaluate that. For instance, it would have to have a component that talks about professional reflection and evidence that supports that; it would have to have a significant component that evaluates student growth. Her suggestion is that the requirement be put on the teacher to identify and present the evidence to the PSC.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked if a program wasn’t directly aligned, but a teacher was able to receive additional training or education in one of those areas to prove they have met all components, would that be a consideration. The committee’s response was that would be a possibility if the word “or” was used in the language.

Don Coberly stated that the committee will never be able to cover all the possibilities. He feels that using the PSC to police these programs would be almost impossible. He said he thinks the PSC is going to get a lot of paperwork and the PSC isn’t meeting every day.

Ms. Kellerer pointed out that nationally we have a movement towards other routes besides advanced degrees. She does think there would be some work associated with this, but she’s not sure it’s a bad idea. The other states we looked at just list advanced degrees. She stated that she agrees that there is not a lot of research to show that advanced degrees create increased student outcomes.

Supt. Luna said he would like the language to be more defined than just an advanced degree. Maybe we can find some middle ground, whether it’s content specific or pedagogy or something like that and not go any further than that. Ms. Kellerer commented that another option would be to collect data for the first three or four years after we implement this plan to see which pathways and programs are increasing student achievement.

Supt. Luna asked the committee where to start in this consideration. He suggested they could start with language specifying the requirement for an advanced degree that is content specific and pedagogically aligned. There was agreement that this is a good place to start. The committee can talk about the renewal requirements for Tier 3 later and whether there would be renewal requirements involving pedagogy requirements.

There was discussion regarding whether administrator programs would be allowed, or whether the degrees needed to be geared toward keeping educators in the classroom. Ms. Kellerer stated that she would advocate for allowing for administrator degrees impacting student achievement. I think it's appropriate. Many of the students who complete administrative programs stay in the classroom. She shared that most Idaho programs have a strong instructional leadership component, which is heavily aligned with where we would go with the Consulting Teacher endorsement.

Supt. Luna stated that the language would be that one of the requirements to move from Tier 2 to Tier 3 would be that you would have an approved degree including those pertaining to content in the teacher's certification area, pedagogy appropriate for the certification, including administration and counseling types of programs. We are moving away from degree approval.

There was discussion about the proposed language regarding student achievement for Tier 3 being beyond what would be expected from Tier 2 teachers. Ms. Kellerer stated that she thinks they we will have a hard time distinguishing what "beyond" looks like.

The committee looked at the proposed language they had developed so far. Ms. Kellerer said that if the national trend is more teachers already holding Masters degrees when they become certified, then the only thing that differentiates Tier 2 and from Tier 3 is the language regarding student achievement beyond what is required in Tier 2 and the inclusion of distinguished proficiency. Is that going to be enough difference to justify having another tier and paying this teacher \$10,000 more? Ms. Kellerer questioned whether the legislature will see this as rigorous enough? It is feeling like for some people already coming into the profession with Masters degrees, the only real difference is requiring them to teach for five years. If that is the main difference it sounds a lot like tenure. Supt. Luna stated that he feels like our model will encourage people to get their advanced degrees in the right area and teach in Idaho because we value that and will compensate teachers for their work. Ms. Kellerer voiced that she is just trying to ensure that the committee responds to the work they were tasked with. She said she is asking herself whether the legislature will see the plan as being rigorous and guaranteeing student growth.

Representative Harris stated that he was a little dismayed that prices were published already. He said that we have this artificial opinion now of what things are worth. The discussion that we are having is backwards. Is the person who completed the Masters degree equivalent to the person who has done a great job teaching for 30 years. Supt. Luna explained the reason the Task Force put a dollar figure on their recommendations. He said they needed to give the practitioners an idea of what the bar is being set at, and give the Legislature an idea of the increased cost of the plan. Both groups needed to be aware of the commitment that was being made.

Ms. Kellerer shared that she likes the components, but isn't sure the committee has agreed to all of them. She thinks it makes sense that a Tier 3 teacher continues to meet the requirements in Tier 2 for accountability purposes. She thinks there has to be something different about their performance and the only place they have to go is on Danielson's Framework from proficient to distinguished and yet we have to be aware that rubric was not developed to have distinguished

ratings all the time. She also stated that she likes having advanced degrees or additional endorsements that equip teachers in a different way.

There was discussion about the possibility of separating out the certifications that require Masters degrees to become certificated, such as counselors, school psychologists, etc. Mr. Raney made the point was made that these people still obtained Masters degrees and have met the requirements the committee is specifying and have gone above and beyond, so he advocated for not adding other stipulations for them.

Ms. Cyr liked adding language also allowing for endorsements that position the teacher to serve in different ways. That brings in a lot of areas that don't have advanced degrees, but still have higher expectations. Ms. Kellerer suggested that maybe PSC takes that up. There are already a couple of teacher leader endorsements. Supt. Luna asked if someone held the endorsement, they use it to qualify for the increase in teacher compensation. Ms. Kellerer said she felt like with those endorsements, the teacher would use those skills regardless of the teacher's assignment. Those teacher leader endorsements have more requirements than other endorsements.

Supt. Luna asked if endorsements should be treated separately from advanced degrees. He also clarified that we have endorsements that can be obtained without receiving a degree and asked if we eliminating those from counting? Mr. Raney responded that for the purposed of moving tiers, yes they would be eliminated.

The group began to discuss the proposed language regarding student growth. Currently, there is a requirement for student achievement in Tier 2, and Tier 3 teachers still have to meet Tier 2 requirements. Does the committee want the Tier 3 student achievement requirements to be more than what is required for Tier 2? If so, how would that be identified? Mr. Raney advised that in Tier 2 they left that up to districts. The current proposed language is purposefully vague and uses the word "beyond" to indicate that when a district is signing off on the recommendation for a teacher to go to Tier 3, they are saying that this teacher shows greater student outcomes than most teachers. Mr. Raney advocated for leaving this determination up to districts, as well. Outcomes could still be shown for teachers who work with at-risk students. Ms. Kellerer suggested that maybe there could be a requirement of consistent growth over a period of time. The bottom line is that year after year, teachers can show that students grow while in a specific teacher's classroom. The committee discussed that growth is going to look different depending, on where you are and who you are serving. Currently, we compare students to other students who are in similar rates of growth. High performing students are only compared to high performing students, and low performing students to low performing students.

Ms. Kellerer stated that she is advocating for student achievement. She doesn't know that the committee can define the word "beyond" but it will still be growth that we are pleased with.

Supt. Luna suggested that districts recommend for Tier 3 based on performance in the top quartile in your district, by your district measures. Then we audit 10% of teachers and look at the body of evidence that shows they are a top performing teacher. They would use the same measurements they are using for Tier 2, but these would be their top performers they are recommending for Tier 3. Ms. Kellerer responded that percentiles or percentages scare her

because there is always a bottom half. She shared the example of having a team of teachers that are all doing outstanding work, but having to determine which two are above the other two, even though all four of them are doing an outstanding job. They don't talk about the benchmark that we want. She said that she would advocate for the adjective to be consistent or sustained student achievement. There should be two to five years of data to look at to determine whether a teacher has a positive impact on students.

Ms. Cyr asked what data would be used to make this determination. Supt. Luna responded that it would be the measurements identified in the Tier 2 list. Representative Harris asked if they have to be as good as Tier 2 or better than Tier 2. Supt. Luna confirmed that is the purpose for this discussion. What are the requirements going to be in addition to an advanced degree or NB Certification?

Representative Harris commented that if they can't show student growth, it doesn't matter if they have a Master's degree or NB Certification.

Supt. Luna asked the administrators on the committee, if we use the philosophy of allowing districts to develop the measures and identify those who are above average or superior, how would that play out at the local level? Mr. Grover responded that they would use the same assessments they use now to distribute differential pay. They use multiple measures, so it isn't just tied to one assessment.

Ms. Cyr shared that she doesn't think a recommendation from the district should play into whether or into whether a teacher can move to Tier 3 or not. If the person is consistently showing growth by the measures we identified in Tier 2 that should satisfy the requirements.

Mr. Grover said their district wants to point to the things that mean student growth in their district. We can use multiple measures that we think are very good in our district to see how we are doing. We weigh each of those. The different measurements help us figure out pretty quickly which students are moving forward.

Representative Harris stated that the things being described work well in a career ladder evaluation process. The difficulty that we are having is that we are trying to make this into a licensing requirement, then the whole thing changes.

Supt. Luna asked if the comments were leading towards the opinion that teachers would always have a Tier 2 license, but there are measures that would get them to another rung on the ladder and more money, but not additional licensure. If that is the case, maybe it doesn't matter whether you have Tier 2 or Tier 3 licensing.

Representative Harris stated that there is a difference of \$10,000 because we've mixed licensing with career ladder. If we're going to have a different license for the higher performer we need to draw the line somewhere and have specific measures.

Supt. Luna said he thinks what's important is that they want an initial license and then a step above that and we recognize that is where most of our teachers will exist. But how do we

financially and professionally recognize those that are above that level? Maybe it isn't important to call it a license. It is a step on the career ladder, though. What is the purpose of having a Professional License if you can't lose your license, but you can move down to Tier 2?

Mr. Hancock responded that what the committee has been trying to do is fill in the details on the recommendations from the Task Force. Those recommendations are pretty clear. They have recommended 3 Tiers of licensure. Higher levels of performance are recognized through higher levels of licensure. Tiered licensure essentially acts as the gateway to the different rungs on the career ladder.

Ms. Kellerer commented that a lot of the committee's discussion is around student achievement and wow much is enough. None of the states we have looked at are using this as one of their requirements yet. We need to be careful here. We are on the edge of an important step and we ought to be congratulated for understanding that this is about student achievement and not just about teacher performance in the classroom. We have to be careful to not paint ourselves into a corner that is so difficult and so untried that we have unintended consequences. This is new territory.

Representative Harris shared that he still doesn't feel like we necessarily know why we want this third license. He said they have been struggling for a while with the reason for this license. If we determined what those requirements were, that would drive the requirements for getting there, as it would in any other licensing field.

Supt. Luna proposed that the committee keep working on the third level and then take their thoughts to the State Board next week and tell them these are our thoughts, but we are struggling with whether it should be a license or not.

Representative Harris said there are two reasons for a 3<sup>rd</sup> Tier. One is to reward vastly superior teachers or reward advanced degrees and endorsements. That seems performance oriented and you're back to those student growth measures, which is almost impossible to do. If we are doing it only to reward teachers with advanced degrees or NB, that seems like career ladder. Need to define why we want a third tier.

Supt. Luna suggested that maybe it's not an additional license. This came out of eight months of work from another task force and the recommendation was multiple tiers.

Representative Harris voiced that he feels that the committee is still struggling with the need for Tier 3.

Supt. Luna responded that he thinks the issue is whether or not that should be a different license. He said he does think there is a need for a third rung, whether that results in a license or just an acknowledgement. He asked if they could talk about what it would take to get to the master level. Without agreement on whether or not this is a license, we are currently talking about student achievement and what we want to see in the area of student achievement at the master level?

Mr. Hancock suggested that maybe you just say three years of consecutive student achievement above average, as determined by the local district. It leaves broad discretion to the local school districts to use the measures and tools that work for them and they think are important.

Ms. Brookover pointed out that if the decisions are made at the district level, teachers are only being compared in their own district. There would not be consistency across the state. There would be varying degrees of success at that level.

Mr. Hancock responded that there would be different measures and tools, but he doesn't think it will be well received if we mandate this from the state level. Supt. Luna confirmed that this idea would give districts the latitude to develop measures. The student demographics are different district to district and each district knows what they can realistically expect from their district.

Ms. Brookover stated that if a teacher comes from Boise and moves to a rural district, they might be able to make it in a rural district when they couldn't make it in Boise. She said the committee just has to decide whether they are comfortable with that. It is not a consistent measure.

Supt. Luna said he gains a little comfort knowing that the SDE currently audits 10 % of licensure renewals. If we use the same process here, we can determine whether district procedures are sound. If it is determined that they are not using legitimate procedures to make these recommendations then we will have to decide whether to put more side boards in place or scale back local control.

Ms. Kellerer said that she likes this idea, but that we have to audit and lead the nation in providing that footprint. She stated that she is still not comfortable with the words "above average". Removing those words would give districts more latitude. Ms. Cyr suggested using three consecutive years of consistent student growth, as defined by the local school district. Supt. Luna responded that we don't want the norm. We want the outstanding teachers.

Representative Harris asked if a district could make everyone in their district outstanding or exceptional. Supt. Luna responded that we would catch that in the audit process.

There was agreement that growth looks different in every place. The committee acknowledged that they know where they want to go with this and know what kind of teachers they are talking about, but it is hard to define and word smith this recommendation.

Supt. Luna proposed that the committee discussed what will go to the State Board at next week's meeting. He said that he is comfortable going to the board and saying, 'Here's a status report.' Then they will provide their input and we will get back together and tackle this again at our next meeting. He asked if everyone could agree that any motions put forward are withdrawn. Ms. Cyr withdrew her motion.

Supt. Luna reiterated that they present a status report to the State Board about where the committee is with Tier 3 and here is where we are struggling and what our concerns are. Ms. Cyr added that it also needs to be represented that the committee is struggling with the need for a third tier of licensure. Supt. Luna agreed.

Supt. Luna reviewed that the committee talked about the amount of time needed, the discussed and agreed on multiple pathways of performance based pieces of evidence. He acknowledged that the group is not going to get to appeals today. Ms. Kellerer asked if that could be done is a subcommittee. Supt. Luna responded that it could if there are people who are want to do that. It was confirmed that the Board feels that the appeals process put forward is too cumbersome for districts. Districts felt like almost anything in the evaluation could be appealed, not just the overall recommendation. Supt. Luna shared that Linda Clark would rather see appeals handled at the PSC level. She felt that would mean there wouldn't be as many appeals at the local level if it was handled that way.

The committee began to discuss upping the requirements of the Danielson evaluations. Supt. Luna reiterated that that expectation is that most of our teachers will live at proficient. If there is a step above that, what would that be? Mr. Grover responded that he thinks we do want to see some 4s. He feels that we want to see some consistent ratings over time, rather than just one snapshot. The initial evaluation data will be gathered while they are in Tier 2. We would expect to see them move around, but they should continue to show that they are distinguished as a teacher, even if they are in different areas. We are not just looking at one evaluation in one year. We are able to show that they are meeting a higher number. I don't know how we decide what that percentage or number is. He stated that he thinks they need to be able to show it.

Mr. Raney shared that he doesn't know that we are going to come up with a perfect outcome, but he proposed language: Average of at least one distinguished component in each of the four Danielson domains during three consecutive years. Mr. Grover said he thinks four may be a little low, since to move to Tier 2 they have to have proficient in all 22 domains.

Ms. Cyr stated that she was interested in knowing what people are getting on average. How many distinguished ratings. Mr. Grover said he could pull his data and bring that back to the committee. He suggested that the committee also look at a larger district, like Boise or Meridian. Ms. Cyr said that she would additionally like to know if there were any basic ratings given to teachers who have been teaching for five or more years.

Mr. Raney suggested that they remove the numbers from the proposed language for now. He altered the statement to: a yet-to-be-determined number of distinguished components in each of the four Danielson domains during three consecutive years.

Ms. Brookover stated that she agreed that the requirements for Tier 3 should be a step-up from what is required for Tier 2.

Mr. Raney proposed that the same language be added to the NB pathway, as well, since most likely they are already doing this and it will be easy for them to show that they already meet these requirements. Ms. Cyr stated that she disagrees with that, as they are now pulling things out that are already imbedded. This was shown by the crosswalk they already found.

Supt. Luna suggested that at the next meeting they spend some time learning about the details of NB Certification. He stated that he doesn't want to assume that these things are found in NC, but

if they are imbedded in the process he is comfortable not including the specifics. Let's find out what the specifics are and what they aren't. Ms. Cyr suggested there could be language that put a comma after the requirements are listed out, and then say, 'which are included in the NB process.'

Supt. Luna said he thinks the State Board needs to understand that we have more work to do and want to collect more data about NB. Also, we still need to look at maintenance and teachers coming from out-of-state.

There was discussion about whether teachers coming from out-of-state could move directly into Tier 3. It is anticipated that would be an option, particularly if they came with NB certification. For other pathways, there could be an optional provisional license to give the teachers time to get the data they need to show evidence that they meet all Tier 3 requirements.

Ms. Cyr agreed to try to set up someone to talk about NB Certification at the next meeting so the committee can drill down to specifics. It was agreed that it would be helpful to have information regarding what the future plans of NB.

Adjourned at 3:55p.m.